

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

FRIDAY, May 8, 1998

Washington Post

May 8, 1998

Pg. 1

Cohen Orders Exhumation At Tomb Of The Unknowns

DNA Tests May Identify Vietnam Veteran

By Bradley Graham
Washington Post
Staff Writer

Weighing the sanctity of one of the country's most hallowed grave sites against the military's obligation to identify its war dead, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen yesterday ordered the exhumation of remains of the Vietnam veteran buried at Arlington National Cemetery's Tomb of the Unknowns.

The decision to open the crypt was made to allow for DNA testing that Pentagon authorities said stands a good chance of confirming the veteran's identity.

Relatives of Air Force 1st Lt. Michael Blassie, who was shot down over South Vietnam in 1972, have pressed for the disinterment, believing the bones in the tomb belong to the missing pilot. A Pentagon panel concluded last month that the remains could indeed be those of Blassie or Army Capt. Rodney Strobridge, both of whom disappeared on the same

day near An Loc.

While laboratory tests several years before burial in 1984 proved inconclusive, the panel said that advances in forensic techniques have since increased the likelihood of identifying the remains. It recommended exhumation.

"If we can identify the remains now, we have an obligation to try," Pentagon spokesman Ken Bacon told reporters yesterday. "The families of fallen service members deserve nothing less."

The move may do more than simply solve the identity mystery. By allowing modern science to probe further, it could well mark the end of the whole military tradition of unknowns. With recent Pentagon rules requiring all soldiers to provide DNA samples, defense officials say the chances of body fragments remaining unidentifiable after future wars are approaching zero.

Plans call for construction of an eight-foot-high, white plywood "privacy fence"

around the marble and granite crypt starting the night of May 13, followed by removal of the steel casket the next day. A crane will be used to lift the crypt's top during the \$20,000 operation. The remains will be handed over to forensic and anthropological experts from the U.S. Army Central Identification Laboratory and transported for examination to the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology in Bethesda.

Defense officials who briefed reporters on the procedure stressed that the exhumation would not disturb three separate nearby crypts for other unknown soldiers from World Wars I and II and the Korean War. Since establishment of the first tomb for unknowns on Armistice Day in 1921, the area has become one of the most visited sites in Washington. Graced by a full-time honor guard, it is meant to memorialize all the nation's unidentified war dead.

Military forensic experts cautioned that DNA testing

may not solve the mystery of the remains in the Vietnam tomb. They said the odds are better than 50 percent that enough genetic material can be extracted from the bones in the crypt -- four ribs, a pelvis and a right upper arm -- to establish a match with relatives of Blassie or Strobridge. But much will depend on the condition of the bones.

"It's biological evidence, and like all other biological evidence -- bone, soft tissue -- the DNA itself is held together by chemical bonds, and if these chemical bonds are exposed to environmental insult -- ultraviolet sunlight, acidic soils in the ground, intense heat, bacteria, which are involved in the degradation process, all these things can degrade the DNA," said David Rankin, a U.S. Army forensic anthropologist who will take part in the examination. "And so you don't really know in this case, until you try it. So that's why I say it's not a guarantee, but it's a

Weapons inspectors see Iraq getting upper hand

Pentagon hopes to cut Gulf forces

Washington Times...See Pg. 2

Senate Panel Votes No On Military-Base Closings

New York Times...See Pg. 3

Marines' Judge Given View From Rear Cockpit

Defense Argues Backseaters Not At Fault

Washington Post...See Pg. 3



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



good attempt."

Military authorities have identified seven other servicemen missing from Vietnam whose bones may lie in the tomb. But Blassie, who was 24 when he vanished, and Strobridge, who was 30, are considered the most likely candidates.

Blassie's A-37 attack plane was shot down on May 11, 1972, about 60 miles north of Saigon. Strobridge's Cobra helicopter suffered the same misfortune in the same area on the same day. The bones now in the Vietnam crypt were recovered five months later by South Vietnamese troops.

For eight years, the remains were labeled "believed to be" Blassie's because they had been recovered with his military identification card, parachute, remnants of a life raft and other effects suggesting they had come from an A-37 crash. But laboratory testing in Hawaii found the remains did not match Blassie's height, age or A-positive blood type. The results of the blood type test -- O-negative -- did fit with Strobridge, although not enough other evidence did to declare a positive identification.

So the remains were reclassified as unknown and interred in the Vietnam crypt during an

emotional 1984 Memorial Day ceremony presided over by then-President Ronald Reagan.

Pat Blassie, the pilot's sister, expressed delight yesterday at the decision to reexamine the remains. "We're one step closer to bringing our family member home," she said.

But while Blassie's family has pushed for opening the tomb, Strobridge's parents have said they would prefer if the crypt remained undisturbed. Six years after the helicopter aviator was listed as missing in action, his family had him declared dead and held a memorial service. They have little interest now, they said, in stir-

ring up the past.

Veterans groups have sided with the Blassies, expressing support for disinterment provided it is done with dignity. Blassie's relatives, most of whom live in St. Louis, have said that if the remains belong to their missing pilot, they want to bring the bones home for burial.

If the remains are identified, a senior defense official said there has been no decision on whether to put another unidentified set in the Vietnam crypt. Nor has a decision been made to restore the remains to the tomb if no match is found.

Washington Times

May 8, 1998

Pg. 1

Weapons inspectors see Iraq getting upper hand

Pentagon hopes to cut Gulf forces

By Stewart Stogel
SPECIAL TO THE WASHINGTON TIMES

NEW YORK — U.N. weapons inspectors say they believe the Clinton administration, frustrated by a lack of support from other countries, has given up on ridding Iraq of its outlawed weapons and is quietly dropping support for their efforts.

"We're no longer on their radar scopes. We're dead and [the Iraqis] know it," said a senior official with the U.N. Special Commission (Unscm), the agency charged with finding and destroying Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

Iraqi officials also sense a collapse in support for the sanctions imposed on Iraq after the Persian Gulf war and are moving aggressively to take advantage.

"There is a fundamental shift in the dynamic in the [Middle East], and [U.S. officials] know it," Iraqi Foreign Minister Mohammed Saeed al-Sahaf said during a visit to New York.

"They have little support [in the Security Council] for the indefinite continuation of sanctions. The pressure is building," he said.

Even Bill Richardson, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, conceded that the Clinton administration had "to fight" to retain the sanctions when they were renewed for another six months on April 27.

Senior Pentagon officers told The Washington Times this week they want to significantly cut back the ground and air forces that were concentrated in the Persian Gulf when Iraq broke off cooperation with the inspection teams early this year.

One officer said the Defense Department may ask to shrink force levels by this summer from the current 38,000 to about 20,000 and one aircraft carrier — the same level as before the latest crisis.

"This is [Washington's] last hurrah," said the Unscm official, who spoke on the condition he not be identified.

"Once [U.S. forces] leave, only a major confrontation will get them back. It has been seven years, they have lost interest. [Unscm] is imploding and everybody knows it."

In Washington, State Department spokesman James Foley denied last night there has been any reduction in the administration's commitment to keeping Saddam in check.

"We are not giving up on that effort at all; we are in it for the long haul," he said.

"We are 100 percent committed to maintaining the sanctions until there is 100 percent compliance with the U.N. resolution" calling for Iraq to give up its weapons of mass destruction.

Still, there is a growing sense

among U.N. diplomats that Mr. Richardson has been outmaneuvered on the Security Council by his Russian and French counterparts.

"There is no leadership [by the United States] in the Security Council," said one ambassador who is normally sympathetic to Washington.

Another Western European diplomat said Russian Ambassador Sergei Lavrov "has sensed the vacuum and has capitalized on it."

Iraq scored a diplomatic victory yesterday when Unscm chief Richard Butler approved the lifting of a 5-month-old travel ban on Iraqi officials, saying Baghdad had met all the conditions required.

"Iraq has granted unrestricted and unconditional access to all those sites the commission has wished to inspect, including sites designated by Iraq as sensitive and presidential," Mr. Butler wrote in a letter to the Security Council.

The November resolution said

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

the ban should be lifted one day after UNSCOM certified that Iraq was "allowing the Special Commission inspection teams immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to any and all areas ... as well as to officials and other persons the Commission wishes to interview."

Next week, the Security Council is expected to publicly endorse a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the U.N.-affiliated atomic watchdog, which would effectively "close the book" on Baghdad's atomic weapons program.

While Washington doesn't dispute the agency's findings that Iraq's nuclear capabilities have been neutralized, it wanted to delay any endorsement until later in the year.

The reasoning, according to Mr. Richardson, was that it is still too soon to reward Iraq while so many other arms issues are outstanding, especially in the chemical and biological fields.

But the British ambassador, Sir John Weston, told reporters recently that he had "no problem in publicly endorsing the findings of the IAEA report."

Mr. Weston's sentiments were echoed by ambassadors from Russia, France and China, all permanent members of the Security Council. Portugal and Sweden, which usually back U.S. positions, also agreed, leaving Washington virtually alone in its opposition.

"This [endorsement] will be a major victory for Iraq," said Ahmed Snoussi, Morocco's U.N. am-

bassador and a senior Arab diplomat.

Portuguese Ambassador Antonio Monteiro, who chairs the council's sanctions committee, explained Baghdad's diplomatic success as old-fashioned "dollar diplomacy."

"There are oil contracts to be awarded and the Iraqis know that it brings influence," he said.

Many of those contracts are expected to go to French and Russian companies. Iraq owes Russia more than \$6 billion for economic and military aid before the invasion of Kuwait.

Iraq's U.N. diplomats, sensing the shifting tide, said they see no need to confront the United States, especially when they are making headway in the Security Council.

Senate Panel Votes No On Military-Base Closings

By Steven Lee Myers

WASHINGTON -- The Clinton administration lost a pivotal Senate committee vote Thursday in its effort to close more military bases, despite warnings from the Pentagon that keeping unneeded bases open was sapping resources for troops and weapons.

Thursday's vote dealt a serious setback to Secretary of Defense William Cohen, who lobbied intensively this year to win approval for a new independent commission to identify more bases to close.

In public and private appeals to Congress, Cohen had warned that the failure to close bases could cost the Pentagon \$20 billion that could be better spent building new weapons systems, from Air Force fighters to Navy aircraft carriers.

But the Senate's Armed Services Committee, meeting behind closed doors to draft the Department of Defense's authorization bill, narrowly voted to reject an amendment that would have authorized a single round of base closings in 2001. The administration had proposed holding two rounds, with the bases chosen by a commission, in 2001 and 2005.

"Even though we knew this would be a difficult vote, the outcome in the Senate Armed Services Committee was nevertheless extremely disappointing," Cohen said in a statement. "Not providing the department

with the ability to reduce billions of dollars in wasteful spending on unneeded bases will deprive the men and women in uniform of the resources essential to fulfilling their mission."

It was the second year in a row the committee had voted not to approve additional base closings. The issue could still come to the Senate floor, but Cohen's aides had viewed Thursday's vote as a critical hurdle.

While a vote for base closings is never popular -- and certainly not in this, an election year -- this session's debate was roiled by the leak of an internal memorandum that reignited Republican anger over President Clinton's decision in 1995 to try to save the jobs at two bases slated for closing by turning the work over to pri-

vate companies.

In a memo dated April 26, the acting secretary of the Air Force, F. Whitten Peters, wrote that the White House's deputy chief of staff, John Podesta, wanted the Pentagon to encourage Lockheed Martin to bid for contracts at one of those bases, McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento, Calif.

In an unusual step to quell the furor, much of it from lawmakers in states with bases bidding for the same work, Peters recused himself from any decision involving the contract at McClellan. And even though the White House said the memo inaccurately described Podesta's views, many lawmakers used the memo to rail against new base closings.

Sen. John Warner, R-Va., an influential member of the Armed Services Committee,

New York Times
May 8, 1998

cited the controversy in reversing his vote Thursday after endorsing additional base closings last year.

The legislation the committee rejected Thursday was actually a compromise -- drafted by Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Carl Levin, D-Mich. -- that would have authorized one round of closings and removed the president from the final approval.

Supporters of base closings vowed to take the issue to the full Senate, but the chance for success there is minimal, and opposition in the House is even stronger.

Sen. Joseph Lieberman, D-Conn., said that Congress had to face the reality that it could not continue spending money maintaining bases while spending elsewhere suffered. "The battle," he said, "is going to go on."

Washington Post

May 8, 1998

Pg. 4

Marines' Judge Given View From Rear Cockpit Defense Argues Backseaters Not At Fault

By Steve Vogel
Washington Post
Staff Writer

CHERRY POINT, N.C., May 7—The two Marine officers who sat in the rear cockpit of the U.S. jet that killed 20 people in a gondola tragedy in Italy should not be held re-

sponsible for the deaths, their attorneys have insisted. Today, in an effort to show why, the defense brought a military judge to this Marine Air Station so that he could sit in the back of an identical jet.

The outing took place on the third day of a military hearing

to determine whether Capt. Chandler P. Seagraves and Capt. William L. Raney II should be court-martialed for their role in the Feb. 3 accident in the Italian Alps, in which they were riding in an EA-6B Prowler that sliced the cables

holding a gondola.

Though Seagraves and Raney had no control of the plane, they face the same charges as the pilot, including involuntary manslaughter and negligent homicide. If convicted by a court-martial, the officers could be sentenced to more than 200 years in prison. The pilot, Capt. Richard Ashby, and the navigator, Capt. Joseph Schweitzer, are scheduled for a hearing next month.

Today the hearing officer, Lt. Col. Ronald Rodgers, prosecutors, defense attorneys, both defendants and family members made an early-morning trek here from Camp Lejeune, 30 miles to the south, where the military hearing is being held.

Rodgers, who is not an aviator, sat in a new Prowler for more than an hour while it was parked in a hangar, receiv-

ing briefings from crew members and interviewing a witness about the configuration of the cockpit. A military court reporter was perched on the platform near Rodgers, straining to hear the testimony and enter it into the record. Raney and Seagraves, also wearing flight helmets, watched the proceedings intently.

From the back seat, Rodgers had no view forward. The rear cockpit in a Prowler is a entirely separate structure from the front cockpit, and occupants have views only to the left, right or above through the canopy.

In testimony back at Camp Lejeune this afternoon, defense witnesses cited that lack of visibility and other factors limiting the role of the backseaters in the aircraft.

Seagraves "had no more control over how that plane

went around that mountain than you do here sitting in North Carolina," Capt. Marcus A. Moore, a Prowler pilot in Seagraves' squadron, told a prosecutor during cross-examination.

The prosecution argues that the two backseaters had a duty under Marine rules to object if the pilot was flying unsafely. Raney and Seagraves are charged under a theory that "all the flight crew contribute to a safe mission, whether or not you had a hand on the flight stick," said Lt. Col. Steven M. Arbogast, head of the legal services support section at Camp Lejeune. "They have a duty to assist."

Witnesses have testified that the crew members have an obligation to call out "knock it off" if they think the pilot is flying too low, too fast or otherwise recklessly. A pilot would be bound to honor the protest, according to the testi-

mony.

Defense witnesses testified that both Raney and Seagraves are safety-conscious officers who would have objected if they had seen something untoward.

Prosecutors entered into the record a description of the accident given by crew members to an officer at Aviano that a prosecutor, Maj. Daniel J. Daughtery, said "certainly differs from the story that they told to the [Marine investigation] board." Daughtery did not reveal the contents of the statement.

William R. Seagraves, the father of the accused crew member, said in an interview that today's testimony underscored his son's lack of culpability. "There was nothing he could have done," said the elder Seagraves, a retired Marine F-4 Phantom pilot.

Philadelphia Inquirer

May 8, 1998

Pg. 11

Pentagon goes after old foes: High costs and inefficiency

By Michael D. Towle

INQUIRER WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON — Once the home of the \$640 toilet seat, the Pentagon has gone on the offensive in an effort to cut costs and red tape in the budget-sensitive post-Cold War era.

One early victory: That toilet seat now costs just \$35.

But critics — inside the Pentagon and out — believe the Defense Department has a long way to go in administrative reform, particularly when compared with America's aggressively efficient business community of the 1990s.

"Although our military is clearly the strongest in the world, our defense establishment is still working to keep pace with a commercial sector that, restructured, reengineered and revitalized, is now thriving in a dynamic global marketplace," said Jacques Gansler, undersecretary of defense for acquisition and technology.

The Pentagon is looking for more cost-effective ways to do everything from ordering Army boots to streamlining the enormously complex process of building a \$25 million fighter aircraft.

The goal is to have more money

available for personnel and weapons at a time when the Pentagon's acquisition budget has decreased about 70 percent since its peak in 1985.

Kathy Eppers, who directs acquisition reform efforts at Lockheed Martin Tactical Aircraft Systems in Fort Worth, Texas, said the government and Lockheed had worked together in innovative ways to slash costs from the F-16 fighter production process.

The Pentagon, she said, has given the company more freedom to find the best, most cost-effective way to produce parts for the F-16 and assemble it. Moreover, the department has allowed Lockheed to give that same freedom to the myriad suppliers that contribute to the program.

"The government has said they want to put in place contracts that are performance-based," Eppers said. "They don't tell us how to do our processes, they just tell us what they want the end item to be able to do."

In the past, the Pentagon had demanded that contractors use approved processes to

produce even the smallest parts on the aircraft.

"They would say: 'This is how you paint something. This is how you put it together. These are the rivets you will use.'"

"Now we use our process that should — if we're smart — be a better, more efficient process."

Lockheed's efforts have made it a national model for acquisition reform, Pentagon officials said. The company is a leader in reducing the amount of paper used in the contracting process, a key Pentagon demand.

Eppers said Lockheed sends much of its data on production to the Pentagon oversight officials electronically. The move, she said, has reduced the "cycle time" for delivering the information by 80 percent.

"Anytime you are cutting cycle time, you are saving costs," she said.

But not everyone sees much improvement at the Pentagon.

Last month, Inspector General El-

eanor Hill, the Pentagon's top government watchdog, said a new purchasing system designed to save money by eliminating traditional controls had produced millions of dollars in overpriced spare parts, including screws for \$76 each and an electrical bell for \$714.

Hill said that the system was similar to those used by commercial businesses, but that the Pentagon needed to work harder to see that its buyers drove hard bargains, looked elsewhere for the parts at lower prices, and bought in large quantities to gain discounts.

Sen. Tom Harkin (D., Iowa) also has challenged the new free-wheeling purchasing system.

"Recent acquisition reforms intended to reduce the costs to taxpayers may be allowing defense contractors to overcharge the government," Harkin said. "At the very least, the Pentagon should require these companies to fully refund all the overcharges before awarding them any new contracts."

Gansler acknowledged there had been "isolated instances" in which the system had failed. But he argued that overall the Pentagon's purchasing practices had improved.

"Using commercial business practices over the past five years, the wholesale inventory alone was reduced \$721 million, a 30 percent savings," he told a Senate panel after Hill's report was released.

"I am certain that you appreciate the fact that, as we begin what amounts to a complete restructuring of the way we do business, we are going to make a few mistakes."

Defense Daily

May 8, 1998

Pg. 1

House Panel Authorizes \$398 Million For Seven More C-130J Variants

By Sheila Foote

Though Congress this year will not add extra funds to the administration's FY '99 defense budget request, the House National Security Committee (HNSC) found a way to recommend spending increases in selected programs, including \$397.6 million in authorization for seven additional variants of the Lockheed Martin [LMT] C-130J aircraft.

By a vote of 50 to 1, the HNSC on Wednesday night approved an FY '99 Defense Authorization Bill that recommends a total of \$270.8 billion in defense spending. That amount is consistent with the administration's request for \$257.3 billion in DoD budget authority and \$13.4 billion for Department of Energy nuclear weapons programs.

Unlike in the past three years, in which Congress added a total of more than \$20 billion to the Pentagon's defense requests, the House panel this year was constrained by the five-year balanced budget agreement.

Nonetheless, the committee did make adjustments within the topline defense number to reflect committee priorities. The HNSC recommends \$48.9 billion for procurement, an addition of \$250 million to the DoD's procurement request. It recommends a total of \$36.1 billion for research, development, test and evaluation, the same as the administration's request, but also makes adjustments within that total.

In major procurement programs, the panel recommends funding increases totaling more than \$1.4 billion. The HNSC offset the funding increases in part by cutting more than \$400 million in unobligated balances from DoE weapons programs, said Military Procurement Subcommittee Chairman Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.).

The committee also cut three of the 30 Boeing [BA] F/A-18E/F Super Hornets requested by the Navy, saving \$213 million. Hunter said the committee "thought that was reasonable in light of the historic low-rate initial production" numbers for aircraft.

If the committee's recommendation to provide 27 Super Hornets in FY '99 is approved by Congress, the Navy will have contracted for 59 of the fighters in three years of low-rate production, Hunter noted. That total is still higher than the typical number of aircraft procured under LRIP contracts, he said.

Aside from the C-130Js, here are some of the committee's other recommendations:

- \$300 million for National Guard and Reserve equipment;
- \$75 million for United Defense, L.P.'s Bradley A2 upgrade program;
- \$86 million for post-production support for Northrop Grumman [NOC] B-2 bombers;
- \$50 million for navigation safety modifications for Air Force aircraft;
- \$32.5 million for advanced procurement of Teledyne Ryan [ALT] Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicles;
- \$40 million for Lockheed Martin Multiple Launch Rocket System launchers;
- \$66 million for Lockheed Martin F-16C/D fighters; and
- \$20 million for Lockheed Martin/Raytheon [RTNA/RTNB] Javelin missiles.

The panel recommended some funding cuts in research and development programs, including a \$20 million cut in the request for the Space-Based Laser and a \$25 million cut in development funds for the DD-21 destroyer, said House Military Research and Development Subcommittee Chairman Curt Weldon (R-Pa.).

"I think the Navy has enough money in the pipeline" for the DD-21, Weldon told *Defense Daily*.

The HNSC recommends authorizing \$120 million to the Navy's Theater Wide missile defense program, for a total of \$310.4 million. Of the recommended increase, the panel designates \$50 million for upgrading ship-borne radar.

The panel also decreases production funds for the Lockheed Martin/Raytheon PAC-3 missile defense program by \$40 million, but increases R&D funds by \$56 million.

"The committee believes this reprioritization of funds will help to assure a successful test program and to establish a more robust initial rate of production," according to a HNSC press release.

The HNSC press release on the bill can be found on the committee's homepage at <http://www.house.gov/nsc/>.

Battleship Row

*Maneuvering to Float Bayonne
as a Landlubbers' Attraction,
New Jersey Outflanks California*

Washington Post

May 8, 1998

Pg. 29

By Guy Gugliotta
Washington Post
Staff Writer

What's in a name? If you come from New Jersey, it often means snubs from snobs all over the country. After all, New Jersey isn't New York, isn't Philadelphia and isn't much of anything to most people except a Turnpike pit stop on the way to somewhere else.

This week, however, New Jersey hit the jackpot, inducing congressional committees in the Senate and House to designate the battleship USS New Jersey for donation as a museum and tourist attraction.

And guess what? New Jersey wants it. California wants it too, and maybe its plan will win the Navy's competition, if there is a competition. The House bill says the ship has to go to New Jersey, forget the previously mandated competition. But let's face it: Either way, the ship ain't called the "California."

How all this happened is not entirely clear because defense committee meetings are secret. The Navy has three World War II battleships left, and Congress requires that two of the three remain in "reserve status," ready to come back on active duty if needed. When the meetings began Monday, the USS Iowa was headed for museumhood. When they finished yesterday, the pick was New Jersey. The third is the USS Wisconsin.

Rep. Mike Pappas (R-N.J.),

a member of the National Security Committee, said, "I have not been operating undercover," but acknowledged "I haven't been talking about it publicly," either.

"Well, we spoke to [Senate sea power subcommittee Chairman] John W. Warner," New Jersey Sen. Frank R. Lautenberg (D) said of the Virginia Republican. And, added New Jersey Sen. Robert G. Torricelli (D), "I've worked with the other side [Re more often than they [the Californians] have."

Warner, a former secretary of the Navy and a friendly man clearly tickled by "the incredible interest in this -- such romance," nevertheless was mostly noncommittal. He noted, however, that picking the ship did not necessarily mean Congress had guaranteed where it would go.

Federal law requires the Navy to hold a competition among rival communities. "California has the right to compete," Warner said. The House version of the bill, however, changes the law, sending the New Jersey straight to New Jersey.

Whichever version prevails, Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) is not overjoyed: "Nomenclature has put every other state but New Jersey at a disadvantage." She pledged to try to get the Iowa back in the mix as the legislation moves through Congress.

Meanwhile, the New Jerseyites are trying not to gloat, even though, when Fisherman's Wharf and cioppino in San

Francisco lose out to car crushers and bologna subs in Bayonne, it's worth a smirk.

"Now, now," Torricelli scolded. "Bayonne is simply the better choice. There is no U.S. Navy presence in New York harbor, and some symbol is important."

Battleships are fabulous attractions. They're 887 feet long, weigh 45,000 tons, draw 38 feet of water, and with battle flags flying and 16-inch guns at the ready, perhaps nothing on Earth has ever better epitomized sea power.

Last year, after sifting for months through five competing proposals, Secretary of the Navy John H. Dalton sent the USS Missouri, the ne plus ultra of warships and scene of the Japanese surrender, to Pearl Harbor.

San Francisco, a loser in that race, turned to the Iowa.

Until this week, the Wisconsin and the New Jersey were the reserves, and Iowa was tourist bait. San Francisco's private, nonprofit "Historic Ships Memorial at Pacific Square" developed its plan, a bay-side pier, museum, memorial and "disaster command and control facility."

"We're prone to earthquakes here, but since the Iowa floats, it wouldn't be affected," said Historic Ships' fund-raiser Art Hoffman. "We could house 1,500 rescue workers." He said Historic Ships had raised more than \$110,000 of its planned \$5.5 million.

Until this week, Historic Ships was working with the

USS New Jersey Battleship Commission to get all three ships mothballed so New Jersey would get the New Jersey and San Francisco would get the Iowa.

Then came what Hoffman called this week's "sneaky switch," and with Iowa off the table San Francisco discovered it was competing with a tiger.

It turns out New Jersey has had its eye on the New Jersey -- and on no other battleship -- for years, has raised almost \$4 million and has a long-range \$20 million to \$25 million plan to develop a "multilingual international museum" to soak up New York tourist dollars.

The New Jersey commission raises money from specialty battleship license plates and a state tax checkoff that pulls in \$300,000 per year. In winter, the commission would rent out the ship two days per week as a corporation conference center for \$75,000 to \$100,000 a night.

"Nobody double-crossed anybody," New Jersey Assemblyman Joe Azzolina (R) said of this week's developments. "What we tried to do was get all the ships released. Then somebody came up with this idea" to switch ships.

And, as San Francisco is finding out, "we're ready to roll," said Azzolina, chairman of the New Jersey commission. "I'm a grocer, so I think 'location, location, location!'" And location doesn't get any better than Bayonne, he added. "Only five minutes from the Turnpike -- Exit 14A."

Defense Daily

May 8, 1998

Pg. 8

If Merger Fails, Lockheed, Northrop Would Seek New Deals

By Vago Muradian

Should a federal judge decide to block the proposed merger between Lockheed Martin [LMT] and Northrop Grumman [NOC], both companies would seek new deals to bolster their strategic market positions, senior executives from both firms said.

"We have been a consolidator...in this industry, we will certainly look at our options going forward," Kent Kresa, Northrop Grumman's the president, chairman and CEO, said following an address at the Global Air & Space '98 conference in Arlington, Va. "I can't say what we'll do next, but certainly we will continue to look at the landscape and do what's right for our company."

James "Micky" Blackwell, the president of Lockheed Martin's Aeronautics sector, and Thomas Corcoran, the president of the company's Electronics sector, both said their company would press ahead with niche acquisitions

without the merger.

Both companies have attained their strong market position--Lockheed Martin as the world's leading defense company, and Northrop Grumman as the nation's No. 4 contractor--through a vast array of mergers and acquisitions. Lockheed Martin is composed of 17 different businesses, while Northrop Grumman is the product of five major deals.

All three stressed that while they would prefer closing the \$11.6 billion transaction to create a united company with greater earnings and competitive potential, their companies would remain viable without the deal.

"As I've said many times, we are very much in favor of supporting this merger," Kresa said. "We were a very viable company prior to this merger...we are a viable and energetic company today, and we will be a viable and energetic company if this does not go through."

The government on March 23 filed suit in federal court asking that the proposed deal be blocked, arguing that an enlarged Lockheed Martin would violate antitrust law, stifle technological innovation and competition, and jeopardize national security.

The companies, however, contend the deal would make Lockheed Martin more competitive against rivals Boeing [BA] and Raytheon [RTNA/RTNB], adding that the consolidation of the two would generate at least \$700 million in annual savings for the Pentagon.

Blackwell added that with or without the merger, Lockheed Martin would forge ahead with niche acquisitions of aircraft service and support companies to strengthen his company's standing in the lucrative support market. Such deals would allow the company to support the planes it has already built and ones about to enter service, such as the stealthy F-22 fighter.

Blackwell has long said that Lockheed Martin wants to support all of the aircraft it has built. A key component of that strategy is teaming with government depots in novel partnerships to perform the work, Blackwell said.

"They have great facilities and workers," he said. "We want to take advantage of that, and we already are."

Lockheed Martin is already teamed with the Warner-Robins Air Logistics Center at Robins AFB, Ga., to support the F-22 fighter after it enters service.

Baltimore Sun

May 8, 1998

Pg. 1-B

Officers Suspected In Ammunition Thefts At Spy Agency

By Tom Bowman

WASHINGTON -- Nearly a dozen members of the police force that guards the top-secret National Security Agency are suspected of stealing ammunition from the agency, sources and federal officials said Thursday.

The thefts, which included up to 50,000 rounds of ammunition, represent an embarrassing incident for the National Security Agency, an intelligence operation that eavesdrops on foreign communications and makes and breaks codes. Besides agency officials, agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms are investigating the thefts.

Although no arrests have been made, several police officers have been implicated, officials said. But details about both the thefts and the progress of the investigation remained sketchy Thursday.

Larry Stewart, special agent

in charge of the bureau's Baltimore office, declined to comment on either the amount of ammunition stolen from agency headquarters in Fort Meade, Md., or the number of officers from the agency's Security Protective Officer force who are under investigation.

National Security Agency officials also declined to discuss the investigation. The agency released a brief statement Thursday saying it was "nearing completion on an investigation involving Security Protective Officers."

Agency sources said two sergeants on the force have been allowed to resign as a result of the investigation, including one who oversees the force's ammunition and weapons. At least nine officers are under investigation.

The sergeant who was in charge of ammunition, William R. Fabus, said he had resigned voluntarily on May 1 after he was questioned by agents.

"I was not aware that anything was missing," said Fabus, 36, of Catonsville, Md., adding that he expects no further inquiries or criminal charges. "I was told there was nothing criminal that I did."

Fabus, a 10-year veteran of the force, declined to say why he had abruptly resigned. "I don't know where I'm stepping," he said. "If I give out any information considered national security stuff, it would be adverse toward me."

Officials would not say when they believe the thefts began or how they were detected, though one former agency employee said the thefts had been occurring for at least two months. The source said one officer was caught and then began implicating others.

The thefts have resulted in new security procedures at the agency, sources said, and employees have been warned not to talk about the investigation.

The agency, which employs about 23,000 at Fort Meade, is the largest employer in Maryland.

"It shocked a lot of people," the former employee, who requested anonymity, said of the thefts. "(The officers) are not kids; they've been working there a long time." The uniformed police force includes several hundred officers. The officers, whose average salary is about \$30,000, undergo two months of training at a facility in Georgia with other federal police officers, former members of the force said. They also hold the government's top-security clearance.

Officials would not say whether they suspect that the officers were using the ammunition and weapons for their own use or were selling them. FBI spokesmen and staffers on the congressional intelligence oversight committees said they were unaware of the investigation.

USA Today

May 8, 1998

Pg. 6

NEW FIGHTERS: The House National Security Committee approved President Clinton's request to fully fund the F-22 program, setting aside problems found in prototypes of the Air Force's next-generation fighter. The Pentagon will buy two production models of the radar-evading stealth

fighter, continue developing the Raptor weapons system and keep on track for buying six more F-22s in 2000. The General Accounting Office had recommended a production delay because of manufacturing difficulties, and lagging development and testing of avionics and software.

Pact On Israeli Pullback Hinges On Defining Army's Role

New York Times

May 8, 1998

By Steven Erlanger

LONDON -- When President Clinton's special Middle East envoy arrives in Israel on Friday, he is expected to discuss new face-saving ideas for securing an Israeli pullout from 13 percent of the West Bank. The envoy, Dennis Ross, is to have last-minute talks with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu this weekend; Washington has set a Monday deadline for an accord.

The thrust of the new proposals, say Israeli and U.S. officials, is how to redefine a part of the 13 percent that Netanyahu says will pose security risks in any interim pullback. While American officials are firm on the 13 percent -- saying it is the minimum that the Palestinian leader, Yasser Arafat, can accept -- Netanyahu has privately offered about 11 percent.

The other 2 percent includes some 20 Israeli settlements that would fall into Palestinian areas and become enclaves. Israeli officials say such settlements would be difficult to maintain while final borders are drawn in a permanent peace accord and a permanent infrastructure, like special roads, are built to support the settlements.

So Netanyahu and the Americans are discussing an additional classification of land that might make 13 percent seem possible.

Israel currently has total

control over 73 percent of the West Bank, known as Area C. Area A describes land under total Palestinian control. Area B applies to land under Palestinian political control and joint Israeli-Palestinian security control.

The basic American proposal is to move 13 percent of Area C out of Israeli control in stages, in response to Palestinian moves against terrorists and their backers. But what Ross and Netanyahu are discussing is a new category, sometimes called C-plus or B-minus, under which the land will come under Palestinian political control but Israel would have more leeway to control security.

In Area B, for instance, the Israeli forces can have no fixed positions or presence but can only patrol, and then only jointly with the Palestinian police. The negotiators are discussing variations intended to enhance Israeli security control over sensitive areas, especially around Jewish settlements.

The Palestinians are said to be unhappy with this idea but are presumed to be willing to go along to get Netanyahu to agree to a pullback.

But Israeli officials also say reaction to the American deadline, portrayed in Israel as an ultimatum, is hardening opinion in Israel and making it very difficult for Netanyahu to agree, particularly if he is seen to be bowing to American pres-

sure for a specific percentage by a specific date.

"There is concern about precedent, that if Netanyahu succumbs to American pressure now, then American pressure will only be worse in final-status talks," an Israeli official said. "It becomes a symbolic sovereignty issue for him, and saying 'No' to the Americans would be popular."

The deadline was issued in London on Tuesday by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, after two days of inconclusive talks there with Netanyahu and Arafat. She said that if Netanyahu did not agree to the American proposals by Monday, Washington might re-examine its Mideast policy.

To encourage Netanyahu, President Clinton offered to begin talks on Monday, in Washington, on a final accord between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

The reaction in Israel and in Washington was immediate, with Netanyahu's Cabinet and many American legislators in Congress criticizing the administration for putting undue pressure on Israel and appearing to be negotiating for the Palestinians.

Netanyahu asked Albright to send Ross to Israel if there was to be any chance of finding an agreement before Monday. But Netanyahu said Thursday night on CNN Television, "I don't know if we'll get to Washington by Monday be-

cause there are a lot of issues that are left open." Earlier Thursday Netanyahu's spokesman, David Bar-Illan, said Netanyahu "is very unlikely" to go to Washington on Monday.

Ross is to arrive in Israel before the Sabbath starts on Friday evening.

If he feels that Netanyahu will in fact agree -- even if not quite by Monday -- the Americans seem willing to extend the deadline a day or two, and let the Washington talks begin a week later. But the Americans do not want to give Netanyahu any other pretext for delaying a decision that Washington sees as vital in restoring the Middle East peace talks, which have been stagnant for over 14 months.

In Washington on Thursday, Clinton said he was sending Ross to Israel to "literally go the extra mile" in hopes of a breakthrough.

In London Albright's spokesman, James Rubin, said: "She hopes these final days' discussions can make it possible for a meeting to occur in Washington next Monday based on acceptance of the American ideas that were discussed with Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat in London."

Asked what would happen if Netanyahu rejected the invitation, Rubin said, "We will re-examine the situation at that point."

Washington Times

May 8, 1998

Pg. 6

INSIDE THE BELTWAY

by John McCaslin

Don't get involved

Here's an unpleasant thought to digest over the weekend, compliments of the Washington-based Cato Institute.

A new policy analysis by Cato's Ivan Eland, director of defense policy studies, warns: "A terrorist attack with weapons of mass destruction -- almost impossible to deter, prevent, or mitigate -- against a target in the United States could make the World Trade Center, or even the Okla-

homa City bombing, seem minor by comparison."

How to prevent such an attack isn't so easy, we can only gather from the study, given that the United States so often is the world's policeman.

Mr. Eland argues that "the only viable way to reduce the very real threat of such an attack is to reduce U.S. interference in the disputes and conflicts of other nations."

Military intervention, he goes on to say, should be confined to the "rare instances" in which American vital interests are at stake. He cites U.S. interventions in Somalia, Bosnia and Haiti as having "nothing to do with America's national security."

Wall Street Journal

May 8, 1998

Pg. 1

Washington Wire

A Special Weekly Report From
The Wall Street Journal's
Capital Bureau

GENERAL DISPLEASURE: Brig. Gen. Russell Honore of the 1st Cavalry Division tells Army acquisition officers in a confab, "You are fielding pieces of crap." He blasts high-tech gear that fails in the field. Gen. Honore says in an interview his remarks were "part of a healthy process" of feedback.

Showdown Diplomacy

Washington Post

May 8, 1998

Pg. 31

By Stephen S. Rosenfeld

It is high noon in the Middle East. The possibility of a collapse of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations led the United States to offer its own plan to complete an interim settlement. The Palestinians accepted the American terms. The Israelis dug in, and a painful but necessary American-Israeli confrontation now looms.

Yasser Arafat's most salient flaw now is not bloodiness but ineffectiveness. He still must demonstrate he can get serious about his interim-settlement obligations. He must cut off the Palestinian national movement's terrorist left wing, author of the movement's crimes and, not least, its character.

Meanwhile, the Clinton administration has summoned Binyamin Netanyahu to accept, by next Monday, further West Bank "redeployment" and a "time-out" on building new settlements. A shift to final-settlement talks would then ensue. But to get there Netanyahu must reduce his nationalistic right wing and assemble the pro-peace, center-left coalition that has been there all along waiting for the right leader to bring it to life.

These developments leave

Bill Clinton facing the large challenge he has shied away from so far. He must stand up to fierce pressures in the American political arena to satisfy the insatiable Israeli ultra-right. He must bring to bear his own principled pressures in a strategy that many Israelis know is awkward but essential to break through to peace.

Israelis live under daily suicide-bomb threats and longer-term missile threats, not to speak of ceaseless effusions of Arab hate. Americans are fortunate never to have experienced such an ordeal. It takes some nerve for safe people elsewhere, who will not bear the direct consequences of misjudgment, to define Israeli security needs. That Netanyahu is the duly chosen leader of the region's sole democracy is a further argument against butting in.

But to come to a security judgment consistent with making peace with the Palestinians induces in many Israelis dread and resistance. Over the years they have been unable to rise above these inhibitions. At this late moment, it sounds patronizing and interventionist but is in fact realistic and responsible for the American government to offer its own best judgment and to reinforce

the many Israelis of a like persuasion.

This obliges the United States to act with a sense of deep caring. Caring includes seeing to Israel's strength, moderating the Palestinian movement and providing a safer regional and international context. These are demanding tasks, but tasks made familiar by nearly 30 years of American-directed peace-seeking in the Mideast.

The earlier conventional wisdom was that only within the Israeli Labor Party's scheme of things was there a hint of a concept of what Walid Khalidi calls a territorial living space for Palestinians. But the lava tumble of Israeli politics has provided for a test -- the one currently in its now-or-never stage -- of a contrary Nixon-to-China theory. It holds that only a government of the right can do what an opposition of the right would not permit another government to do.

Netanyahu has an undoubted lust for annexation in his heart. Certainly his extremist supporters resist any stepping back. But his more pragmatic supporters are already shaping a rationale of realism that could yet be invoked to justify concessions made under American incentives.

Any Palestinian state that Israel allowed into being would be a pale thing, especially in its security powers, but it would be something that Palestinians could build on. The percentages of West Bank territory that Israel has so far indicated it might release for a new Palestine are not yet out of Bantustan range, but the figures could improve. Just as only security can induce Israelis to respect Palestinian political goals, so only statehood can induce Palestinians to respect Israeli security goals.

But nothing positive will happen if the United States is not faithful to its own proclaimed policy. Netanyahu launched a preemptive strike in the cautionary letter that 81 senators wrote Bill Clinton early in April. As mistaken as it would be, it is possible that Netanyahu may be tempted to try to beat down the president on his own political turf.

You could say that Israelis have at least as much claim to intervene in American diplomacy as Americans have to intervene in Israeli security. But it is important for American regional and great-power considerations for Bill Clinton to prevail. For large Israeli interests too, it is also important for Bill Clinton to prevail.

HARRY SUMMERS

Washington Times

May 8, 1998

Pg. 21

"Could the United States be risking another Pearl Harbor or Persian Gulf surprise?" asked a recent land-power survey from the Association of the U.S. Army.

"Despite today's vastly superior reconnaissance and intelligence capabilities, we believe the answer is yes. Misconceptions and complacency regarding the durability of today's hierarchy of power, in which the United States is clearly dominant, and wishful thinking about the general willingness of the major powers to accept the current status quo could set the stage for another major war."

When it comes to wishful thinking, the essay asked, "Is it now prudent to believe that Russia and China are satisfied with the current state of affairs in which the United States is clearly the world's dominant power? Both countries have

Putting stability and strategy at risk?

long memories of former greatness, and it is highly doubtful that they will accept U.S. global and regional leadership any longer than they must."

Our actions don't make it any easier for them. As the New York Times editorialized on April 29, the eve of the Senate vote on NATO expansion, "Though it has offered financial assistance and friendship to Russia . . . it is as if America had sent Japan and Germany a few billion dollars when (World War II) ended, while devoting most of its energy to strengthening a military alliance against those

countries. It is delusional to believe that NATO expansion is not at its core an act that Russia will regard as hostile."

Thus it is disturbing, to say the least, to find out that the one most delusional of all is Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, who should know better. Writing in that same edition of the Times, she acknowledged that the most fundamental argument critics have put forward is that the admission of any new NATO member from Central Europe will harm our relations with Russia.

"Critics who focus on Russia's

opposition to enlargement are cynically assuming that Russia will always define its national interests in ways inimical to our own," wrote Mrs. Albright. "They believe that Russia will always be threatened and humiliated by the desires of its former satellites to go their own way, that it will never get over the end of its empire. I have not seen one scintilla of evidence to support the critics' fears."

Such evidence may not be long in coming, not after the Senate voted 80-19 on April 30 to approve NATO expansion with the addition of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. "A new fault line of ethnic tension and superpower stress is emerging in Central Europe," The Washington Times reported a few days later.

"The Russian government is following a general approach of seeking to find areas where it can define itself in opposition to the interests of the United States," says Helmut Sonnenfeld of the Brookings Institute. A former chief State Department analyst on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Mr. Sonnenfeld warns that the Russians "are now seeking to express their iden-

tity by defining themselves against the United States and by posturing, or taking sides, against what they see as aggressive and insensitive U.S. policies in [Russia's] traditional spheres of influence."

Not only is NATO expansion a crime against current stability, it is a folly against future strategy.

"Concerning geopolitics and the balance of power in the 21st century, NATO expansion is a strategic disaster," said American University Professor Amos Perlmutter in the wake of the Senate vote. "It will upset the balance, turning Russia and China against the United States, undoing the great Bismarckian policies of Henry Kissinger that brought China and America together against the Soviet Union [and] will unnecessarily burden the relationships between the great powers in the 21st century."

Worse, this potentially crippling blow at American security was done almost haphazardly. Noting an indifference in the debate leading up to the vote, the April 29 Los Angeles Times editorialized that "the necessary two-thirds of the Senate appears ready to make

NATO bigger for no better reason than it seems a good thing to do. A decision of basic and enduring strategic importance is not getting the rigorous analytical questioning it cries out for."

"President Clinton's promises that expansion will make NATO stronger and allow European democracy and prosperity to flourish," the editorial continued. "But examine these soothing assurances, and their lack of substance is immediately apparent. There is no hint here or anywhere else of what mission would be played by a stronger NATO. Nor is any reason given why a military coalition should be considered the best or even a useful vehicle for spreading prosperity and democracy in Europe."

Those questions, never asked in the Senate debate, may well, by default, have to be answered on the battlefields of the future.

Harry G. Summers Jr., a retired U.S. Army colonel, is a distinguished fellow of the Army War College and a nationally syndicated columnist.

Long Island Newsday

May 7, 1998

Pg. 49

NATO Shouldn't Push Farther East

By Dimitri K. Simes

THE U.S. SENATE'S recent 80-19 endorsement of NATO membership for Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary is an important step in the right direction. Despite a noisy and sometimes almost hysterical campaign against expanding the alliance, enlargement opponents never made a credible case that bringing in the three nations could damage NATO or, more specifically, American interests.

Nevertheless, in asking what should come next, excitement over the first round of enlargement cannot be allowed to obscure tough questions about further expansion. The fact is that in alliances, as in so many other areas, too much of a good thing can be dangerous.

The administration seems to believe otherwise. Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, the president's Russia policy architect, has said, "The process of enlargement is ongoing. No one is going to be excluded on the basis of geography and history. And there is no reason why the second round should

be any more difficult or controversial than the first. In fact, it should be easier."

One would like to assume that Talbott, a Russia scholar who has demonstrated a tendency to bend over backward to be sensitive to Russian concerns, is simply playing politics to ingratiate the administration with ethnic lobbies eager to secure places in the NATO club for their homelands.

But what if the administration does not really know better and genuinely doesn't see a fundamental distinction between the perfectly prudent first wave of expansion and the tremendous costs and risks of alliance membership for the Baltic states and Ukraine? The differences are profound. Estonia, Latvia and Ukraine have thousands of miles of common borders with Russia (like Poland, Lithuania borders only on the Kaliningrad enclave). Despite some diplomatic progress, Estonia and Latvia still have serious unresolved disputes with Moscow over both territory and their treatment of their ethnic Russian minorities.

Russia's frequent overstatement of the degree of discrimination against ethnic Russians in Latvia and Estonia (there is virtually no discrimination against the smaller Russian minority in Lithuania) should not obscure the fact that the discrimination is real and represents official policy. To put it simply, hundreds of thousands of Russians in the two countries, including those born there, were denied citizenship when Estonia and Latvia won independence - with the strong support of Boris Yeltsin's Russian government - from the Soviet Union in 1991.

Perceived as the last manifestation of Soviet imperialism, they were disenfranchised overnight and became second-class citizens in countries they considered to be their own.

This makes NATO membership for Latvia and Estonia vastly different in Russian public opinion than membership for Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary - which is an abstraction to most Russians. Millions of Russians have relatives and friends in Latvia and Estonia and their abuse - both real and alleged - is felt strongly and personally across the Russian political

spectrum. An invitation to either nation to join NATO would be seen almost universally as a hostile act: geopolitically threatening and morally cynical.

Worse, in contrast to the three states about to be admitted to NATO, Estonia and Latvia simply cannot be defended militarily with conventional weapons. Their territories are too small and too far away. To hope to repel an attack in an age of highly mobile warfare, the alliance would have no alternative but to rely upon nuclear arms. But is a return to nuclear brinkmanship really the way the administration hopes to promote European security?

Ukraine has a more amicable relationship with Russia, but one reason for the better climate between Moscow and Kiev is precisely that the latter has not sought NATO membership. If Kiev were to lobby for membership, it is quite possible that Moscow would switch its support from Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma to opposition neo-Communist and pro-Russian politicians. Such a strategy could easily destabilize eastern Ukraine, and particularly Crimea, both of which

have substantial ethnic Russian majorities.

Moscow also has a much stronger economic card to play vis-a-vis the Baltic states and Ukraine than in Central Europe. Since about half their foreign trade is with Moscow, Russian economic sanctions would be devastating to local development in any of the four and could only be overcome by an unlikely multibillion-dollar aid package from the West.

If international politics was entirely fair, a credible case could be made that Lithuania, with its better human rights record, more amicable relationship with Russia and better location should be in a separate category eligible for consideration as a candidate in a second wave of NATO enlargement. But to make such a case would be more controversial domestically than the Clinton administration can likely stomach.

Accordingly, notwithstand-

ing Talbott's flawed logic, geography and history - and, of course, current circumstances - should determine the direction of the second stage of expansion. And that direction should be south rather than east. Romania, Slovenia and Bulgaria are all eager to join the alliance, and their membership would improve stability on NATO's southern flank, including in the troubled Balkans, without provoking Russia.

Meanwhile, while receiving all necessary support from NATO, the Balts and Ukrainians should be reminded that Russia remains a leading power in their neighborhood and that working toward a cooperative relationship with Moscow is at least as important to their security as seeking NATO membership.

Dimitri K. Simes, president of the Nixon Center, is a special correspondent for Newsday.

Washington Post

May 8, 1998

Pg. 30

For the Record

From remarks made Wednesday in the Senate by Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Tex.) after recent travel to the Persian Gulf, Bosnia and Brussels:

Many of us have been concerned that the deployments overseas -- that our operations other than war -- have been wearing out our troops but also affecting their training and their capability to respond if needed. I think the trip made our beliefs even more firm that we must look at the deployments and the number of them and take some measures not only for military quality of life but for training and readiness. . .

The other point that I think was very important is in the meeting with NATO ambassadors, we talked to the secretary

general about having a clear mission for NATO, and let's have a strategy for just what we will and won't do. Are we going to have a NATO that not only is for our common defense but for the common security threats outside the NATO area? I think that's a very important question that needs to be addressed by our allies and part of a strategy for the long term.

I appreciate the fact that we were able to come at a time when we are setting strategy for NATO and when all of us would like to see a clear mission both in Bosnia and the Middle East. But most important, the biggest picture that we saw is that we've got to take care of our troops. We've got to address the issue of the readiness and the quality of life as it is affected by the deployments to operations other than war.

NATO Expansion: The Senate Approves

President Clinton can appropriately boast of at least one historic international triumph during his tenure as he points to the Senate's recent 80-19 approval of the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Endorsed in July by the current NATO membership - Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United States - an enlarged NATO is indisputable evidence that there were, indeed, victors in the Cold War, and those victors did not include Russia.

Russian government officials have long opposed NATO expansion, believing the larger alliance could become a political as well as military threat.

In fact, one of the fears of the opponents of an extended NATO membership was that an outraged Russian Parliament will now refuse to ratify the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty II.

Sen. John Warner, R-Va., meanwhile, wanted to halt addition of members to NATO for the next three years and Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., warned that adding three former communist states to NATO will drive Russia into a corner and could lead to a nuclear confrontation.

"We may stumble into the catastrophe of nuclear war with Russia," he said.

Certainly there will be costs, but hardly the ones painted by Moynihan.

Direct enlargement costs are estimated by the State Department to average \$700 million to \$900 million annually, with the U.S. share of these costs averaging about \$150 million to \$200 million annually till 2009.

But the costs of not embracing the future of NATO could have been much greater.

The most efficient and cost-effective way to guarantee stability in Europe is to do so collectively with European partners, the

Arizona Republic

May 6, 1998

Pg. B-4

administration has maintained, noting that alliances save money: Collective defense is both cheaper and stronger than national defense.

A decision to defer enlargement, much less to withhold it altogether, would send the message to Central and Eastern Europe that their future does not lie with NATO and the West.

Listen to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright:

"Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic have borne the brunt of this century's most terrible wars; they have been the victims of its greatest tyrannies. Yet they have always maintained their allegiance in spirit to the family of freedom-loving European nations that NATO embodies and exists to defend."

Listen to President Clinton:

"NATO has shifted to smaller, more flexible forces better prepared to provide for our defense in this new era, but also trained and equipped for other contingencies. Its military power remains so unquestioned that it was the only force capable of stopping the fighting in Bosnia. . . . (The) alliance's enlargement will make America safer by making NATO stronger, adding new forces and new allies that can share our security burdens. Let me be very clear: NATO's core mission will remain the same - the defense of the territory of its members. The addition of new members will strengthen and enhance that mission. In pursuing enlargement, we have made sure not to alter NATO's core function or its ability to defend America and Europe's security."

There might be arguments against fostering democratic reforms throughout Europe, bringing stability and a collective dedication to uniting a region with common goals, but, frankly, and thankfully, the U.S. Senate could not find any, and NATO grows.

The upside of NATO expansion

Washington Times

May 8, 1998

Pg. 22

Pat Buchanan's arguments in "Downside of the NATO expansion" (May 4) are too shallow to be left unchallenged. Does anyone really believe that our differences with Russia over Iraq, Iran and Serbia, to mention just a few, have resulted from our intention to expand NATO? These problems plagued U.S.-Russian relations long before NATO's eastward expansion and have to do with both countries' differing political interests and concepts.

Further, Mr. Buchanan warns that one day our country may have to go to war with Russia to defend a new member of the NATO alliance, such as Poland. But this scenario is only a distant possibility. If it is not admitted into NATO, however, Poland would be a much more likely target of Russian aggression. This is precisely why Eastern and Central European countries want to join NATO. In turn, their memberships are in the interest of all Europe.

As for the Baltic States, Mr. Buchanan points out that our European allies have shown little enthusiasm for bringing them into NATO. But the fact is, no NATO member is on record opposing the inclusion of the Baltic States — provided they meet all the requirements for NATO membership. The strategic position of the Baltic States is such that their independence is vital to the security of all Europe.

If Mr. Buchanan is so concerned about the deterioration of U.S.-Russ-

ian relations because of NATO expansion, why doesn't he urge Russia to improve relations with its close neighbors and, above all, to clear its history of communist falsehoods (e.g. that the Baltic States voluntarily joined the Soviet Union in 1940)? Then perhaps these Eastern European countries would have less inclination to join NATO.

Unfortunately, Mr. Buchanan is not interested in the fate of Eastern European nations. As he has repeatedly made clear, the United States has no vital interest in this part of the world. This is the sort of attitude that led to both world wars, resulting in unimaginable disaster for the whole of mankind.

CAMILLA KUUS
Washington

Pat Buchanan makes some good points in his commentary March 4 decrying NATO expansion. He says, "Feeling deceived and humiliated, Moscow is now opposing U.S. policy almost everywhere." He cites Serbia, Iraq, Cyprus, Latvia, Iran and China as examples.

Mr. Buchanan's point that we broke our promise not to expand NATO to Russia's border is also valid. However, an expanded NATO is generally accepted by major U.S. policy-makers, and it appears to be a done deal.

Thus, how to handle NATO

expansion becomes the more pertinent question. Here is a suggestion worth consideration:

Welcome Russia into NATO. The offer should be friendly, while pointing out how dangerous Iraq, Iran and China are to world peace and democracy. Russia promised to move toward democracy, which in the long term is the main hope for world peace.

Such a welcome should offset Russia's arguments and concerns about NATO expansion. The objective of welcoming Russia into an expanded NATO is that Russia within NATO would be considerably less of a problem than what it is currently and may become in the future.

A reason to support NATO and limited expansion is that NATO is a desirable alternative to the United Nations. The United Nations is an expensive, cumbersome, factious organization with little respect for democracy or justice. Within the United Nations, Western democracies are frustrated by nations such as China, Russia, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. NATO is a relatively small group led by Western democracies more able to decide and act against rogue states, genocide, etc.

LEO SAMET
Silver Spring

Editor's Note: The op-ed referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, May 4, 1998, Pg. 26.

Wall Street Journal (Asia)

May 8, 1998

Caught In The Indonesian Vise

By Barry Wain

JAKARTA--What is known as the Dili Massacre mentally scarred the Indonesian armed forces.

The bloodbath happened unexpectedly in late 1991, as troops scuffled with about 2,500 independence-minded mourners moving in a funeral procession in the East Timor capital. Troops opened fire on the unarmed crowd at a cemetery, killing at least 50, and spent half an hour beating and bayoneting those who couldn't escape.

An investigation commission, set up under strong international pressure, criticized the excessive use of force and recommended action against the perpetrators. In a serious blow to military prestige, eight offi-

cers, nine other soldiers and a policeman were punished.

Since then, officers have remained acutely aware of the power of the press--the carnage was filmed--and the potential embarrassment of being caught in gross human-rights transgressions. They are told often by their superiors that they will be held responsible for their actions.

The military high command, it seems, has tried hard to carry out President Suharto's instruction, conveyed by a senior aide: "Make sure what happened in Dili doesn't happen again."

The danger of a similar incident, or worse, has increased since the East Asian financial crisis ensnared Indonesia last August and generated a full-blown political crisis over the 76-year-old Mr. Suharto's dic-

tatorial leadership. As companies go bankrupt and millions of people lose their jobs, mobs have rioted over the rising cost of food and fuel.

Inevitably, it has fallen to the armed forces, known by the local acronym ABRI, to keep the peace. Although a few of its leaders have been involved in questionable activity, ABRI generally has quelled the unrest with restraint.

But students are persisting with the protests, this week forcing their way off campus and onto the streets of large cities, demanding Mr. Suharto's removal. Told by the president to "repress" the demonstrations if necessary to maintain order, the security forces have fired tear gas, rubber bullets and live ammunition at the protesters. Should the situation deteriorate markedly, with perhaps sections of the public joining a

popular uprising, ABRI could be put on the spot. It may have to choose between loyalty to Mr. Suharto and sympathy for suffering citizens.

"It seems likely that, sooner or later, the army will have to reveal its political colors," says the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies.

Despite often being portrayed abroad as no more than the repressive arm of an authoritarian regime, ABRI participates in Indonesian life in far more extensive and complex fashion. For a start, it is the most powerful institution in the country, the glue that holds it together in turbulent times.

Because of the heroic part it played in the struggle for independence against the Dutch, ABRI sees itself as a people's army and the soul of the nation.

ABRI doesn't just dabble in

politics, as do some other Third-World armies frustrated with incompetent civilian politicians. Its rights are institutionalized under the doctrine of *dwifungsi*, or dual function, which provides for a social-political, as well as a military, role.

The army is represented in the cabinet and parliament, though it has been given a dwindling share of ministerial slots over the years. Retired officers also hold key posts in state-owned enterprises, the judiciary and the authorized trade union movement, and they are city mayors, provincial governors and ambassadors.

Dwifungsi has allowed the military's influence "to percolate into virtually every nook and cranny of society," says Adam Schwarz in his book, "A Nation in Waiting."

But when it comes to preparing for external threats, ABRI isn't exactly a formidable fighting machine. Indonesia has fewer people in uniform as a proportion of its 202 million population and spends a smaller percentage of gross national product on defense than its main Southeast Asian neighbors.

The total size of the forces—under 500,000, including police—is modest when measured against the task of protecting 17,000 farflung islands. The army numbers around 200,000 and the navy and marines 40,000. The 20,000-member air force flies mainly transport planes.

For internal security,

ABRI's obvious weakness is that it is spread thinly. It can handle trouble at a few scattered locations, but it soon runs out of troops and its local command-and-control structure breaks down.

For instance, an independent study of six cases of unwarranted killings by the military from 1991 to 1996, including the Dili Massacre, shows that the officer in charge every time was a first or second lieutenant between 36 and 42, way beyond the usual age for that rank. The conclusion: They were basically losers, poor performers who often had been brutalized and passed over for promotion.

Between 10% and 15% of ABRI's officer corps is world-class, according to one Western analyst, while a further 20% is at least as good as other officers in the region. A reshuffle in February gave the military its most sophisticated, educated and experienced leadership ever.

The half dozen or more top positions currently are occupied by officers who have served on Mr. Suharto's staff, like Commander-in-Chief Gen. Wiranto and army Chief of Staff Gen. Subagyo Hadisiswoyo, who were his aides. Or they know Mr. Suharto personally, such as Lt.-Gen. Prabowo Subianto, who heads the army's Strategic Reserve Command and is married to his second daughter.

"The obvious common denominator among them is their close association with President

Suharto," says John B. Hase-man, a former U.S. defense attache in Jakarta. "But as well, all of these new leaders are well regarded professionals, the best and brightest of a new generation of younger military officers."

A minor criticism of ABRI's handling of recent rioting is that it has been slow sometimes to suppress the violence. In one instance in West Kalimantan, its rapid-reaction force, usually a mobile police unit, was on detachment elsewhere.

Gen. Feisal Tanjung, when commander-in-chief, also seemed to fan racist sentiment by blaming ethnic Chinese for soaring prices. But his successor, Gen. Wiranto, who is also defense minister, has condemned the victimization of Chinese shopkeepers.

A more serious accusation against ABRI is that elements of it are behind the disappearance of a number of dissidents. Official denials are far from convincing.

A fundamental dilemma for civilians seeking political reform is that while they need the army to remove Mr. Suharto, they don't trust the military's stated commitment to gradual democratization. For all its talk about being one with the people, ABRI as an institution has little interest in dismantling Indonesia's strong-state structure and giving the masses a voice.

One development that almost certainly would precipitate military intervention and a showdown is Mr. Suharto's

death, or even severe incapacitation that leaves him unable to perform his duties. Under the constitution, Vice President B.J. Habibie would take over.

Mr. Suharto's chosen candidate, Mr. Habibie wouldn't be accepted as the country's leader by most of ABRI. But how the military would attempt to replace him, and with whom, is the subject of endless conjecture. In the event of Mr. Suharto's failure to complete the five-year term that began in March, "all bets are off," as one analyst puts it.

Speculation about rifts in ABRI centers on the supposed rivalry between Gen. Wiranto and the fast-rising Lt.-Gen. Prabowo. But with all the top leaders beholden to Mr. Suharto, the military can be expected to show considerable unity in the face of adversity.

Ultimately, ABRI is likely to judge Mr. Suharto and his new cabinet on their economic performance. If the country continues to slide indefinitely, provoking further social unrest, the military brass may have second thoughts about supporting Mr. Suharto.

Come crunch time, ABRI commanders would be reluctant to use lethal force against large gatherings of distressed fellow-Muslims representing no alien ideology or subversive threat. Indeed, they may decide it is time for Mr. Suharto to quietly retire, much the same as he did to President Sukarno in 1966.

But there is a long way to go before reaching that point.

Wall Street Journal

May 8, 1998

Pg. 14

Albright's Ultimatum

In London this week, Secretary of State Albright abandoned all pretense of being a neutral mediator in the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. "The invitation [to further talks in Washington] is conditional on these interim issues being resolved on the basis of American ideas." Those ideas are the seemingly arbitrary notion that Israel somehow owes 13.1% of the West Bank to the Palestinian Authority as part of the second of three transfers scheduled by the Oslo Accords. Israel's original offer of roughly 9% was rejected over a year ago by Yasser Arafat, who ever since has refused face-to-face talks

with Benjamin Netanyahu.

Perhaps sensing that the American ultimatum was a violation of the Oslo Accords, which leave the size of the interim transfers to Israel—or at least afraid of his Jewish constituency—President Clinton contradicted Ms. Albright's remarks. "There is no way in the world that I could impose an agreement on them or dictate their security to them, even if I wished to do that, which I don't," he said at a news conference.

So what of Ms. Albright's threat to "re-examine our approach to the peace process"? Well, we think it's indeed

time for a reappraisal. Its conclusion, if honestly conducted, would be that the deadlock over the past year is largely the fault of the United States.

As House Speaker Newt Gingrich said in a strongly worded letter to Mr. Clinton on Wednesday, "lasting peace in Israel can only be achieved through voluntary direct dialogue between the parties. . . . If your administration uses its influence to unilaterally design a 'solution' or force Israel to the table despite Israel's legitimate concerns regarding terrorism, then we are removing any incentive for Chairman Arafat and the Palestinian Authority to negotiate. . . . Worse, America's strong-arm tactics would send a

clear signal to the supporters of terrorism that their murderous actions are an effective tool for forcing concessions from Israel." Well, promising outside pressure is precisely what the U.S. has been doing.

The percentages in question no longer involve the liberation of West Bank Palestinians from foreign occupation; 98% of them already live in areas under PA control. Rather they involve largely uninhabited land that is highly sensitive for security reasons.

The American proposal, for example, could put Palestinian missiles within striking distance of Tel Aviv airport, or give the Palestinians control of important water sources. And given the authoritarian nature of the Palestinian regime and its record of cooperation—virtually none—Mr. Netanyahu's reluctance to make such irreversible transfers is understandable. Indeed, barring a miracle from visiting U.S. envoy Dennis Ross, the

chances of the Israeli cabinet meeting American demands this Sunday—and hence the chances of talks next week in Washington—are practically nil.

Of course, we also recognize the importance of such uninhabited areas in giving some geographic continuity to the proto-Palestinian state. But if Mr. Arafat wants them, he needs to negotiate with Mr. Netanyahu in person and cooperate with him in practice, not send the Americans to do his work for him.

Washington Times

May 8, 1998

Pg. 21

CORD MEYER

The United States and its European allies in the Contact Group imposed new economic sanctions last week on Yugoslavia after U.S. officials warned that Serbian repression in Kosovo could spark another Balkan war.

In a daylong meeting in Rome, officials of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy agreed to an immediate freeze on the Yugoslav government assets held abroad and valued at \$100 million, if President Slobodan Milosevic of Yugoslavia did not halt brutal military sweeps in Kosovo.

The Contact Group also dangled a substantial carrot before Mr. Milosevic, if he helped to settle the Kosovo crisis. It promised eventually to admit Belgrade to the multilateral banks. But there is a question whether any economic pressure could persuade the Yugoslav leader to loosen his grip on the province that he stripped of its autonomy in 1989. Mr. Milosevic only agreed to peace talks in Bosnia in 1989 after NATO bombers attacked the Bosnian Serb capital in Pale.

But as Jonathan Landay has pointed out in the Christian Science Monitor, Kosovo is not Bosnia. "It is more dangerous." Mr. Landay argues that Kosovo could spill across international borders and suck in arch-rivals Greece and Turkey, threatening the stability of Europe.

Last week, the Contact Group agreed to freeze Yugoslav assets abroad in an attempt to pressure Mr. Milosevic to rein in his security forces in Kosovo. By appealing to Serbian reverence for Kosovo as the seat of their empire in medieval times, Mr. Milosevic has tried to boost his popularity among Serbs.

Unremitting causes of Kosovo conflict

But Kosovo's 2 million ethnic Albanians, who are mostly Muslim, outnumber Serbs 9-to-1 in Kosovo. In effect, the Serb police and troops are looked upon as an occupation force encircled by a hostile ethnic group. This could mean "a more vicious, destructive conflict than Bosnia," warns Alexander Vasovic, a military expert at B-92, Serbia's independent radio station. He warns: "Kosovo is going to be like Algeria or Vietnam. The Serbs are going to be isolated in military compounds. The Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) will control the rest."

The massacre of ethnic Albanian women and children in the Drenica region by Serb police in February and March has produced for the rebels an outpouring of support from Albanian communities in Europe and the United States. The KLA has also derived support from traditional Albanian solidarity. And the unrest in Kosovo has generated enormous support among Albanians in Albania, Macedonia and Kosovo.

There is also the potential for Greek involvement. As an orthodox state and ally of Serbia, Greece could decide to enter the conflict on the Serb side. And Turkey as a Muslim state with a large Albanian population could decide to enter on the side of the Albanians.

This week, fighting has raged for a second day in Kosovo, as a senior official warned that full-scale war could erupt in the restive Serbian province. Serbian police claim to

have encircled 200 ethnic Albanian separatist guerrillas in Ponosevac after the Kosovo Liberation Army attacked police in the southwest Kosovo village Sunday.

In an interview published on May 5, Albania's Foreign Minister Paskal Milo warned that war could easily break out in Kosovo. "It is the first time in 50 years that we have such tension on our border with Serbia," Mr. Milo told the Athens-based Vradyni newspaper. "It is the first time that Kosovo Albanians are so determined and organized to claim their rights and take this matter to the end."

The Albanian government has placed its armed forces on alert along the border with Kosovo, according to an Albanian official. The government official reports that the Tirana government planned to create a civilian volunteer force to curb arms traffic and to help refugees in areas bordering the Serbian province.

The Democratic League of Kosovo which advocates independence by nonviolent means has reported that fighting around Ponosevac was an effort by Serbian police to clear ethnic Albanians from the strategic border area. An escalation of the fighting seems unavoidable.

Cord Meyer is a columnist specializing in international affairs and a contributing writer for The Washington Times.

Panel Votes To Change Readiness Reports To Better Reflect Field Status

Frustrated by what it sees as a persistent disconnect between congressional testimony and information received from the field over the state of readiness, the House National Security Committee approved language May 6 that would change the way the Pentagon determines it's prepared to fight.

"Over the past four years, the contradictions between assessments of military unit readiness as reflected in official reports and the observations made by military personnel in the field have become increasingly hard to reconcile," a committee press release stated.

The Pentagon's current readiness rating does not include information on the increase of deployments, the level of morale, the impact of peacekeeping operations, or the increased use of training funds for other purposes, according to the release.

While the Defense Department has been required since 1996 to submit quarterly readiness reports, a General Accounting Office official told committee members March 18 that the reports are not fully compliant. Instead, they only depict information gleaned during senior-level Pentagon briefings that are aggregate and vague (*Inside the Air Force*, March 20, p6).

The committee wants these reports to contain four elements:

- "a unit status report that measures the readiness of service units;
- a training establishment status report that measures the condition of service training institutions;
- a deployment infrastructure status report that measures the ability of service and other defense facilities to deploy and sustain forces;
- and a Joint Forces Status report that measures DOD's ability to successfully conduct the two major theater wars on the timelines of theater commanders-in-chief."

The system must measure readiness at the time of the reporting, and not what it might be at some later date, the release adds.

The Pentagon has until July 1, 1999, to develop a readiness system that reflects the committee's recommendations, according to the release.

At the March 18 hearing, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness Louis Finch argued that much of the information the committee is seeking would not be helpful in determining the state of readiness, but instead would increase unnecessarily the workload of military personnel who collect the data. The Pentagon has already moved to provide the committee the information it seeks, Finch testified, including addressing specific readiness issues such as personnel tempo levels, biological warfare threats, pilot retention rates, recruiting shortfalls, and declining mission capable rates. -- *Jim Snyder*

N. Korea says U.S. fails on nuclear reactor deal

TOKYO (Reuters) — North Korea accused the United States today of not living up to the terms of an agreement to supply it with nuclear reactors and hinted that it may resume its own nuclear program if the United States does not comply soon.

"All facts show that [North Korea] has gone further in implementing the agreement, whereas the U.S. side is not sincerely fulfilling its obligations," a Foreign Ministry spokesman was quoted as saying by the Korean Central News Agency (KCNA).

"Therefore, [we] should no longer lend an ear to the empty

promise of the U.S. side, but open and readjust the frozen nuclear facilities and do everything our own way," the spokesman told KCNA, which was monitored in Tokyo.

"There is a limit to our patience on this matter," he added.

Under a 1994 agreement with the United States, North Korea agreed to halt its nuclear program — which Washington said was aimed at producing nuclear weapons — in return for two 1,000-megawatt, light-water nuclear reactors that would provide it with electric power.

It also called for interim fuel deliveries that would help ease an en-

ergy shortage until the new reactors were on line sometime after 2000.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman said that while North Korea had obeyed the agreement by freezing its nuclear program, the United States had not set out the schedule for fuel supplies this year and had not been delivering fuel to North Korea "in time."

Despite the North's criticism of the United States, the main question hanging over the reactor agreement is whether financially strapped Japan and South Korea will be able to pay the billions of dollars they pledged.

On May 1, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright warned South Korea and Japan that North Korea may resume its nuclear weapons program if a pledge to provide Pyongyang with fuel oil and nuclear-power technology is not met.

House panel criticizes intelligence on Iraq

U.S. intelligence on Iraq was lacking in the most recent crisis with Baghdad, lawmakers said yesterday.

The intelligence given to key field commanders was inad-

equately to support a military campaign, they said.

"Earlier this year, the United States came to the brink of military confrontation with Saddam Hussein," said Rep. Porter Goss, Florida Republican and chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. "Yet we did so without all

of the information necessary to support a serious campaign."

Officials familiar with the issue said the shortfalls were particularly acute in connection with the intelligence community's ability to assess Iraqi capabilities to launch weapons of mass destruction, particularly chemical and biological weapons.

Richardson Said To Be Leaning Toward Energy Job

By Josh Friedman

UNITED NATIONS -- The Clinton administration has asked U.N. Ambassador Bill Richardson to become secretary of energy, and he is leaning toward taking the job, U.N. sources said Thursday.

Richardson, 50, a seven-term New Mexico congressman, has been the U.N. envoy for just over a year. He replaced Madeleine Albright when she moved up to be secretary of state.

A White House official Thursday called Richardson "a valued member of the administration and a leading contender" for the job but would

not confirm whether the final decision was up to Richardson or whether he was waiting for a final nod from the White House.

Officially, Richardson's press office would say only that "nothing has been decided." But some in the U.S. Mission to the United Nations were already speculating about possible successors, mentioning former State Department official Richard Holbrooke, who engineered the Dayton agreement that ended fighting in Bosnia, and former Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell, who just brokered a plan to end hostilities in Northern Ireland.

On a first-name basis with President Clinton, Richardson makes no secret of his desire to seek elected office again. He has told friends he would like to be the vice presidential nominee if Vice President Al

Gore is the Democratic presidential nominee in 2000. If that doesn't happen, he has expressed an interest in running for governor of New Mexico.

After Clinton's 1996 reelection, Richardson was under consideration for the job of secretary of commerce. Richardson, whose mother comes from a prominent Mexican family, is fluent in Spanish. If he takes the job as energy secretary, he would be replacing Francisco Pena, who recently resigned.

Richardson's U.N. tenure has been difficult, with Albright assigning him to seemingly insurmountable special tasks. The most prominent was an assignment within days of his confirmation to travel to war-torn Zaire, now the Democratic Republic of Congo, to persuade insurgent leader Laurent Kabila to adopt democratic principles. Once Kabila had

ousted former dictator Mobutu Sese Seko, Richardson was sent back to persuade him to go along with a U.N. investigation of allegations his troops had murdered nearly 200,000 refugees. The United Nations called off the investigation last month because it was receiving no cooperation and encountering obstruction from the Kabila government.

Richardson also had to deal with weakening Security Council support for maintaining sanctions on Iraq until it is completely disarmed of weapons of mass destruction, or the capacity to build them. A deal he had arranged with Congress to pay nearly \$1 billion in U.S. arrears to the United Nations fell through at the last minute when abortion foes refused to go along with it unless anti-abortion language was specifically included, guaranteeing an administration veto.

Pacific Stars
and Stripes

May 9, 1998

Pg. 3

ROK coastal guards fire on fishermen mistaken for spies; 1 dead, 2 injured

Stripes Seoul Bureau

SEOUL — One South Korean fisherman was killed and two others were wounded when South Korean army coastal guards mistook their boat for a North Korean infiltration craft and fired on it.

A Defense Ministry spokesman said the incident occurred at 3:50 a.m. Thursday in restricted waters near Ulchin, about 140 miles from Seoul on the east coast. The spokesman said coastal guards ordered the 1.5-ton vessel, carrying 12 fishermen, to halt but the fishermen attempted to flee and the soldiers opened fire.

Kim Sung-moon, 60, was killed and two other fishermen were taken to a nearby hospital for surgery. One was in critical condition.

Because of past North Korean infiltration attempts in the area, the spokesman said, any vessels entering the area between 10 p.m. and 4 a.m. must have approval in advance from the military.

The site of the incident is in the same general area where about 100 armed North Koreans infiltrated the South in

1968 and were either killed or captured. It is about 50 miles south of Kangnung, where 24 armed infiltrators entered the country in 1996 after their submarine became stranded on rocks.

In the 1996 incident, 22 infiltrators were killed in firefights with South Korean soldiers during a two-month search of rugged and heavily forested east coast mountains. One was captured and no trace of the other was found. Fourteen soldiers and civilians also died, some by friendly fire.

The South Korean military was strongly criticized in that incident because coastal guards failed to detect the submarine. Readiness was increased at those guard posts as a result.

Pyongyang publicly apologized for the incident four months after it occurred and promised not to send infiltrators to the South in the future.

That promise was broken last year, however, when North Korean spies infiltrated the nation's south coast by submarine. One committed suicide after being captured but another gave authorities information that led to the arrest of other agents who had been operating in the South for at least two decades.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)